APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/182,911	10/30/1998	BARRY G. WILKS	0100.9800830	2532

7590   07/16/2002

JOHN R. GARRETT
MARKISON & RECKAMP, P.C.
P.O. BOX 06229
WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO,, IL 60606-0229

EXAMINER
LESPERANCE, JEAN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2674	

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/182,911	WILKS, BARRY G.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Jean E Lesperance	2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 May 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are pending in the application.

 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 October 1998* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

 a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

 1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

 2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

 3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

Application/Control Number: 09/182,911

Art Unit: au 2674

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-43 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S. C. § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth

in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention Has made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the

manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over patent #

6,104,359 ("Endres et al.") in view of patent # 6,067,071 ("Kotha et al.").

As for claims 1, 19 and 32, Endres et al. teach an application program is received by a

graphical device interface program that normally calls functions of a device driver program to

update a computer screen to reflect the display information (column 5, lines 1-5) corresponding

to receiving capability parameters regarding a first display of the multiple displays; a brush

physical objects may use foreground and background colors provided in a data structure referred

to as drawmode and provided as another parameter in a function call (column 15, lines 23-26)

corresponding to substituting selected display capabilities for the capability parameters.

Accordingly Endres et al. teach all the limitations as recited in claim 1 with the exception of providing the selected display capabilities to an operating system.

However, Kotha et al. teach that only one graphic resolution may be selected for one or both display at a time (column 3, lines 38-40) and also most multimedia computers have the ability to select from one of several display resolutions.

It would have been obvious to utilize the selected display as taught by Kotha et al. in the allocating display information disclosed by Endres et al. because this would allow the display controller to output a plurality of different graphics display resolutions to a fixed resolution display.

As for claim 2, Endres et al. teach a forking driver that is acted as a virtual device driver having some capabilities common to all of the screens and other capabilities dictated by only one of the screens (column 5, lines 13-16) corresponding to determining the selected display capabilities based on a composite of the display parameters of each of the multiple displays.

As for claim 3, Kotha et al. teach most multimedia computers have the ability to select from one of several display resolutions (640 pixels by 480 pixels, 600 pixels by 800 pixels, etc) corresponding to determining the selected display capabilities based on capabilities of a video graphics card.

As for claims 4 and 20, Endres et al. teach a device context of the video display adapter that is initialized by another operating system subsystem "USER" when the operating system is

started (column 3, lines 14-16) corresponding to receiving the capability parameters in accordance with a system start-up.

As for claims 5, 11, 17, 21, 25, 36, and 42, Endres et al. teach a GDI that identifies a graphics device driver for the device specified by the data string (column 2, lines 38-41) corresponding to identifying the capability parameters as primary parameters accordance with a first portion of the system start-up ; other functions providing the operating system and application programs with the ability to control the existence of device contexts (column 2, lines 51-54) corresponding to providing the capability parameters to the operating system in accordance with the first ion of the system start-up; and identifying a first function provided by a first display device driver and a second function provided by a second display device driver ... (column 16, lines 14-22) corresponding to identifying the selected display capabilities as the primary parameters in accordance with a second portion of the system start-up.

As for claims 6, 12, 18, 22, 26, 37, and 43, Endres et al. teach that most multimedia computers have the ability to select from one of several display resolutions (column 2, lines 35-36) corresponding to receiving the capability parameters in response to a monitor change process.

As for claims 7, 23, and 38, Endres et al. teach a forking display driver 290 for allocating display information between two or more screens and the specifics are directed primary to such a forking display driver for use in a case where the computer system runs the Microsoft Windows 95 operating system (column 7, lines 9-14) corresponding to a processing module; and an application program is received by a graphical device interface program that normally calls

functions of a device driver program to update a computer screen to reflect the display

information (column 5, lines 1-5) corresponding to receiving capability parameters regarding a

first display of the multiple displays; a brush physical objects may use foreground and

background colors provided in a data structure referred to as drawmode and provided as another

parameter in a function call (column 15, lines 23-26) corresponding to substituting selected

display capabilities for the capability parameters.

As for claims 8-10, 14-16, 24, 33-35, and 39-41, Endres et al. teach a display information

such as a drawing instruction that is issued by the OS subsystem or an application to a first hDC

GDI transforms the information into a form dictated by the capabilities now supported by the

forking driver (column 8, lines 9-12) corresponding to the operational instructions that cause the

processing module to determine the selected display capabilities based on a composite of the

display parameters of each multiple displays, video graphics card and system start-up.

As for claim 13, Endres et al. teach a drawmode data structure stores both logical and

physical colors. The forking driver temporarily patches the physical colors to provide colors

appropriate for the intersected screen (column 15, lines 26-30); a physical object may be created

and stored for each device driver and adapter combination (column 14, lines 37-38); a copy of

the first device block that is saved to allow an efficient return to the use of a single screen should

the end-user elect to remove all additional screens (column 10, lines 48-51).

As for claims 27-31, Kotha et al. teach in order to generate two video signals having

different refresh rates and resolutions, it may be necessary to generate different dot clock

frequencies (column 5, lines 24-26) corresponding to the capabilities parameters further

comprises a display refresh rate.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Jean Lesperance whose telephone number is (703) 308-6413. The examiner

can normally be reached on from Monday to Friday between 8:OOAM and 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on (703) 305-4709 .

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal drive,

Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone

number is (703) 306-0377.

Jean Lesperance

Application/Control Number: 09/182,911

Art Unit: au 2674

[signature]

Date 7-13-2002

Art Unit 2674

[signature]

RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600